

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 54.—No. 1.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 2, 1825. [Price 1s.

TO THE
FREEHOLDERS OF IRELAND.

LETTER II.

On the Westminster Meeting; on the debate on the Petition presented by Mr. SPRING RICE; on the treatment of Mr. O'CONNELL; on the address to Mr. LAWLESS; and on the Catholic "EMANCIPATION Bill," as it now stands.

Kensington, 31st March, 1825.

IRISHMEN,

THE several topics, stated above, are of deep interest to you, and scarcely of less interest to the people of England. Before I offer you any remarks upon either of them, I will endeavour to give you a clear view of the state of your case up to this day.

For some time it was expected, that a Bill would be proposed, including three things: 1. A repeal of all your disabilities; 2. An enactment for paying salaries to your clergy out of the general taxes of the kingdom; 3. An

enactment for taking the right of voting at elections from a very large part of those who now possess that right. A Bill has, however, been brought in by Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, not including the two latter enactments, which Bill has been read a first time, and is to be read a second time *after Easter*; that is to say, about, perhaps, the 10th of April. If that Bill pass the House of Commons, which will be ascertained at the second reading, the two enactments, just mentioned, are to be proposed, either by separate Bill, or as additions to the Bill which has now been read a first time; so that the Lords may, before the present Bill reach them, know the fate of these appendages.

On the Bill, which has been read, I will remark by-and-by, and I shall show. I think, that it contains regulations most insulting to the Catholics, and an oath, which no honourable man of that communion will ever take. Then come the two enactments, which

A

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

have been called *wings*. Bills used to be mataphorized as *horses*, and any hard condition imposed on its friends, and added to a bill, was called a *rider*. According to the new phraseology, arising, doubtless, from that "education," which is now so fashionable, bills are *birds*, and such conditions are called *wings*; that is to say, things without which the body cannot fly through the Houses.

The wings in question do not, however, appear to be of a very buoyant nature; for, there are many men, even in the House of Commons, who voted for leave to bring in a Bill for *Emancipation*; who voted for the Bill, now brought in, being read a first time; and who will vote for the second reading; who will *not vote for the wings*; but, who will vote *against them*: and, indeed, if it were otherwise, these men would never dare look Englishmen in the face again.

As to the opinions of *the public*, in *England*, with regard to these wings, you cannot have a better proof than that which is furnished by the proceedings at a public meeting in Westminster, which took place, on Thursday, the 24th of March. I shall insert the newspaper report of those proceedings. It is probably, incor-

rect, as to minor particulars; but, in *substance*, and as touching the *great matters* now under our eye, it must be correct; and I beseech you to read it through with great attention; and, when you have done that, to have the goodness to read my observations. Remember, that the enemies of Catholic emancipation *have said*, that the *public*, in *England*, are against that measure. Here you will see what the public has *said for itself* on the subject.

WESTMINSTER MEETING.

Repeal of the House and Window Tax.

Yesterday morning (24th March), a public meeting of the Inhabitant Houscholders of the City and Liberties of Westminster was convened in the open space in Covent-garden Market, pursuant to a requisition presented to the High Bailiff, Arthur Morris, Esq. for the purpose of considering the propriety of *petitioning Parliament for the Repeal of the House and Window Tax*.

A temporary hustings was erected for the occasion in the angle of the Garden nearest to King-street. By the time the hour fixed for opening the business of the meeting had arrived, a dense body of persons, amounting in all to nearly one thousand, had assembled round the hustings. The crowd was of a *very motley character*, and it was obvious that many had collected out of curiosity, and with a view of having what they were pleased to consider fun. This party, at the onset of the business, afforded themselves much amusement by the noisyclamour with which they compelled a fire engine that was attempted to be driven through the crowd, to proceed in a different direction.

The Chair having [been taken by the *High Bailiff*, and the requisition for the convening of the Meeting read,

Mr. *Gardener*, belonging to the Committee, stepped forward, and read the following Resolutions, and moved that a respectful Petition be presented to Parliament to that effect:—

Resolved, “1. That this Meeting have noticed, with great satisfaction and pleasure, the assurances contained in His Majesty’s Speech at the opening of the present Session of Parliament, and the declaration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the increase and general prosperity of the country.

“2. That it is the opinion of this Meeting that the people had a right to expect, and particularly from those encouraging statements, that some portion of the taxes would be diminished, and that His Majesty’s Ministers would, in the first place, have relieved them from those taxes the most oppressive and obnoxious, in preference to others of a minor consequence; that the Repeal of the House and Window Taxes would have taken precedence of all others, as the most harassing, vexatious, and unequal in their operation.

“3. That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the House and Window Taxes should, beyond all others, have received the consideration of the Legislature, not only on account of their being the most oppressive and obnoxious of all taxes, but having been increased to their present high rate in aid of the war only; they, therefore, ought, in justice and equity, to have been repealed.

“4. That the house and window taxes have always been considered a grievance by all classes of His Majesty’s subjects; and the Meeting is of opinion, that the remission of no taxes of equal amount will afford so much direct and substantial relief, and be received with so much satisfaction by the people at large, as the repeal of the house and window taxes.”

Mr. *Hunt* then addressed the Meeting. He said it was so long since he had had the pleasure of appearing before them, that he scarcely believed it was his own voice that was addressing them. He did not know whether they had all heard the Resolutions that had been read; for his part, he supposed many of them had not [cries of “No, no! they could not be heard.”] The uproar had prevented them from being heard, but the Meeting had carried them, because they knew they related to a repeal of the Assessed Taxes. Of all the taxes with which the country was burdened, there was none so obnoxious as the Window Tax, for it was of all things unfair to deprive us of the light of heaven, and the air we breathe. He was not on the Committee—not one of the elect, and had no hand in framing the Resolutions, or he would have made some addition to them. It was a matter of surprise to him, that nine years should have elapsed since the termination of the war, and the electors of Westminster had not been called upon before to petition Parliament upon this subject. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted money in lieu of this tax, he would recommend a reduction in the Pay and Pension List, and again, he said he would do away with the Sinking Fund, as it was a mere delusion, and not productive of the slightest practical advantage to the country. On a former occasion, he had inveighed, as he always would do, against titled pensioners, and he began the list with his Grace of Buckingham, and then followed the Marquess of Camden who held sinecures of 25,000*l.* each. Since that period, one of these Noblemen had had the modesty to give up his pension, and the other had been deprived of it by an Act of Parliament. At the County Meetings for Somerset, he had recommended that Prince Cobourg should not have received so large a sum as had been allowed him, for it appeared to him to be a [cries of “shame, shame”]. He had no objection to

the grant while they were living together, but he thought 50,000*l.* should not be allowed him on her death, to spend in a foreign country. There was another individual, the father of one of their Representatives, and he meant no offence to that gentleman—it was Sir Benjamin Hobhouse; he was in receipt, and had received for years, a pension for doing nothing, and which he thought was one of the sinecures that ought to have been taken off. The sinecures of Lord Arden and of Lord Grenville, he also thought, should be reduced, and which would take off part of the House and Window Tax. It was not a Resolution of this nature that he should propose—he had another topic on which to address them—he meant the proposition which had been brought into the House of Commons, for taking out of the pockets of the people a sum of 23,000*l.* and paying it to the Roman Catholic Priests, to induce them to surrender the rights of the 40*s.* freeholders. Were they willing to submit to this proposition [cries of “No! No!” mingled with some marks of approbation]? Then, now was the time for the Meeting to oppose it—now was their time to inquire why the money is to be taken out of the people’s pockets, and they were tamely to sit by and see the liberty of the 40*s.* freeholders wrested from them. He felt very happy when their representative, Sir Francis Burdett, introduced the proposition into the House of Commons for the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, and every fair-dealing man would contribute his support; but it was with sorrow he beheld the proposition seconded by Mr. Croker, of the Admiralty—then his hopes disappeared; he was of opinion that the Lion and the Lamb could never agree, and that when Mr. Croker seconded the measure, something would be introduced that the public were not aware of. He was sure that this was a mean attempt to render abortive the good design of the Bill introduced by Sir Francis Burdett. He was well

convinced that their long-tried Representative would never consent to a measure, the object of which was to disfranchise nearly half a million of poor but honest subjects. (Cries of “He never will.”) He should therefore propose a Resolution, which would point out to the Ministers in what way they could repeal the House and Window Tax without diminishing the Revenue. Mr. Hunt then moved the following Resolution:—

“That this Meeting has heard, with surprise and indignation, of a proposition to bring a Bill into Parliament to impose a new tax of 230,000*l.* a year, to be collected from the Protestants of England, to pay the Roman Catholic Priests of Ireland, as a bribe to induce them tamely and basely to submit to the treasonable disfranchisement of half a million of their countrymen, the 40*s.* freeholders, who have always, up to this time, enjoyed and exercised, as the dearest birthright of freemen, the right of voting for Members of Parliament.”

The High Bailiff proposed, that it be postponed till all the Resolutions had passed.

Mr. Hunt insisted that it should be immediately put, and that the sense of the Meeting should be taken on it. He was too old a soldier not to be aware that, if deferred, the answer would be, that a Petition had been agreed to, and that nothing further could be introduced into it.

The Resolution was then seconded by Mr. Birt, and carried. The following Petition was then read:—

“To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled: the Petition of the Inhabitant Householders of the City and Liberty of Westminster.

“From the disposition shown by His Majesty’s present Ministers on their coming into office, your petitioners anticipated that before this time much greater concessions, af-

fording a more effectual and general relief, would have been made to the people, and particularly in that department of taxation to which we now beg leave to call the serious attention of your Honourable House, namely, the House and Window Taxes.

"That your petitioners, in every rank, feel the operation of these taxes as a burden; and as many of your petitioners are embarked in trade, and necessarily occupying large and expensive premises, do, from these circumstances, feel its operation in an oppressive degree; while others, embarked on a smaller scale, depending on the chances of trade for the support of families, not being able to satisfy its oppressive demands, frequently become the victim of its claims; and the very many distress warrants issued every year in Westminster alone, is a convincing and fatal proof of the baneful effects of these very oppressive taxes.

"That your petitioners were induced to believe that a total repeal of these taxes would have taken place last Sessions, and the increased and flourishing state of the Revenue since that period warranted your petitioners in cherishing the most sanguine hopes, that, in the present Session, they would certainly have been discontinued altogether.

"That your petitioners feel totally disappointed in the reductions proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as affording no relief whatever to your petitioners; but applying only to such inferior dwellings which, from the poverty of the inmates, are invariably excused the payment of all taxes, year after year, to aid them in support of their family, and prevent them becoming an entire burden to their respective parishes.

"That your petitioners beg leave to remind your Honourable House, that the greater proportion of these taxes were increased during the War; and that the great addition was then considered by your Honourable

House and the People as a grant in aid of the War only; for at the time the increase from 10d. in the pound to the present high duty of *two shillings and ten pence*, on all inhabited houses above 40l. a year, took place, your Honourable House then pledged themselves to the People that this Tax, in the increased state, was to continue six months only after a general Peace: more than nine years have now elapsed since that event, and this Tax, in the increased state, still remains. Your petitioners now urge what, in justice and equity, they had a right to claim these *nine* years past, and call upon your Honourable House, without further delay, to redeem their pledge.

"The baneful consequences of these Taxes your petitioners could much enlarge upon, but it is sufficient to declare they operate extremely oppressive on all householders; that they have been the entire ruin of many industrious persons throughout the Kingdom, and particularly in the Metropolis, by breaking up their establishment under a warrant of distress; at the same time are the cause of great mental anxiety to many hundreds; they therefore pray your Honourable House will, by a prompt compliance with the just and equitable claim of your petitioners, by so doing, put an end at once to such afflicting and oppressive means of Taxation by an immediate Repeal."

Mr. Hunt called the attention of the Meeting to the fact, that the Resolution proposed by himself *was not incorporated in the Petition*. He thought this the greatest insult that ever was offered to a Public Meeting. (Cries of "No, no," and much tumult.)

Mr. Pitman said, they could not know that Mr. Hunt would move any such Resolution.

Mr. Hunt said, the Resolution was no longer his. It had been adopted by the Meeting, and he trusted they would *reject the Petition altogether*, unless that Resolution was intro-

duced into it. Let them do so, and show their spirit as Englishmen.

Mr. *Presland* said, he should object to its introduction, and so he trusted would the Meeting, on the ground of irrelevance. (Cries of "We do, we do!")

A great tumult now took place on the platform; some persons continued to address the Meeting, but they were totally inaudible.

Mr. *Presland* said, the Meeting had been called for the purpose of petitioning for a repeal of the Assessed Taxes, and he thought the Catholic Question ought not to be introduced. He therefore moved, that Mr. Hunt's Resolution should not form part of the Petition.

The *High Bailiff* put the question, and although the cry of "No, no," was immediately raised, the show of hands was in favour of the Resolution of Mr. Hunt. A warm altercation now ensued between the supporters of the Petition and the partisans of Mr. Hunt; and the former inquired, whether the Petition should be adopted. The feeling of the Meeting evidently seemed to be that the Petition ought to include Mr. Hunt's Resolution, and the motion for the adoption of the Petition without Mr. Hunt's Resolution was negatived.

Mr. *Pitman* then moved a Vote of thanks to the Members for Westminster for their conduct in Parliament.

Mr. *Hunt* objected, and said the thanks of the County ought certainly to be given to Sir Francis, as he was an old man, but they ought not to include his Colleague in the same vote, as he was so very young.—The greatest displeasure was manifested at Mr. Hunt's observations, and the original motion was carried.

Sir *Francis Burdett* then stepped forward. He commenced by saying, that as the business of the day seemed to be concluded, he would address a few words to the Meeting. Had he not felt that it was due to them to return them thanks for the compliment just paid him, he should

have deemed it unnecessary to present himself to their notice. The question they had met upon was one of infinite importance to the Electors of Westminster,—it was to Petition the House of Commons, or as Mr. Hunt had said, the Government, for a Repeal of the House and Window Taxes, but the Resolution introduced by Mr. Hunt went to defeat the original intention of the Meeting. He must say that the Resolution had been introduced in the most unhandsome manner; for unless a Gentleman would condescend to let the individuals composing the Committee, know that he intended to move a Resolution, and the nature of such Resolution, how could the Committee draw up the Petition which was to be read to them? Mr. Hunt had proceeded in a most unhandsome manner, and in a way calculated to raise the spirit of discord where nothing but the most perfect harmony and unanimity ought to reign. That Gentleman had come into the room, and had conversed with many of the Committee, and yet never mentioned his intention of moving a Resolution, though all the time he had it in his pocket ready prepared. Now his opinion as to this line of conduct was, that it deserved the appellation of what Mr. Hunt himself applied to a proceeding of some part of the Committee, viz. that of "trickery." [Loud applause.] There are some men who are much better as enemies than as friends, and in that light did he look upon Mr. Hunt. He, for his part, should be much more thankful to him for his censure than his praise. [Applause.] He had said what he (Sir Francis Burdett) agreed with, regarding the Pension and Sinecure list. He had also told the meeting that the father of Mr. Hobhouse, his colleague, was a sinecurist. If this were so, Sir Benjamin might depend upon the opposition of both himself and colleague; but he could tell Mr. Hunt that he was wrong, and that Mr. Hobhouse's father was not on the sinecure list. [Hear,

hear!] Mr. Hunt had also brought forward the Sinking Fund, and mentioned it as a source of great evil; and here, also, he agreed with him; but then these were questions which did not properly form part of the business of a meeting called to petition against a particular tax. It is the business of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to find out a substitute for any objectionable tax. ["Aye, but he will not do the business," exclaimed a voice in the crowd.] If, when similar petitions had been presented, the Ministers had said, "Why do you not point out what we should take off?" the answer would have been, are we to tell them? He said, no. It is the duty of Ministers to diminish the burdens of the people as much as they can, and to raise the revenue by the least objectionable means. [Hear, hear!] Amongst other things, Mr. Hunt had adverted to a much more fertile source of discord than almost any that could be named, when he introduced into the question the state of the people of Ireland. He (Mr. Hunt) demanded that civil and religious liberty, and constitutional rights, be extended to them; so did he, [loud cheers.] But then it was proposed to give 230,000*l.* to the Catholic Clergy. Why we now draw from the English taxes four millions a year to keep down the Irish. Mr. Hunt objected to paying the Roman Catholic Priests. *From the present state of the country, we must pay soldiers or priests.* The question therefore was, whether they should pay 230,000*l.* a year to the Priests for their influence, or *whether they should pay 4,000,000*l.* to support an army, who, with tyrannical and despotic means, would keep down the people of Ireland.* He, for his part, should have no difficulty in making up his mind which course to pursue. Mr. Hunt also stated in his Resolution, that there had been a proposition to disfranchise the forty shilling freeholders of Ireland. *No such proposition had ever been made, and he should not accede to such a pro-*

position; he would rather disfranchise a corrupt borough like Old Sarum, and deprive of their votes the perjured voters of many other Boroughs. [Bravo, bravo!] Such enfranchisement he would endeavour, as far as his influence extended, to prevent—he would endeavour to put the system of voting upon a fair principle [Cheers.] The qualification of the forty shilling freeholders in Ireland had no reference to such a qualification—these freeholders had not the least similitude to what the people of this country understood by forty-shilling freeholders. It was impossible, from the disturbed state of Ireland, to adopt any thing that might conduce to its tranquillity, without some arrangement with the Catholics. This, however, was not a meeting where such a subject should be brought forward, and, therefore, he certainly disapproved of what had been done, for they had annexed a Resolution to their Petition, which would defeat the object of it, [great tumult, and cries of "Hear, hear!"] Would it be believed that any of the Irish advocates of the Catholic cause, who had devoted nearly the whole of their lives in carrying that one object into effect, *had turned traitors all at once, at the time the prospect appeared favourable?* By words people often allowed themselves to be deceived, and, in the present case, they had been *deceived by those used by Mr. Hunt, [applause].* For the great object of obtaining civil and religious liberty and constitutional rights, he should always be a strong advocate, and in so saying, he thought he should not be *deserted by the Meeting, and he hoped they would trust to him when he said he would not desert them, [applause].* He would persevere at all times in carrying an object into effect where he thought he clearly saw that the public would be benefited by it—[loud cheers]. In the attainment of that object he should be *led by what appeared to him to be most for the people's good—[loud cheers followed the*

conclusion of the Hon. Baronet's speech]. When silence had been obtained,

Mr. Hobhouse addressed the Meeting. He returned sincere and heartfelt thanks for the honour they had done him. The censure which he received from Mr. Hunt was to him praise. With regard to himself, he had never, during the six Sessions that he had been a Member of the British House of Commons, given a vote or dropped a single phrase that militated against the interest of his Electors. Young as Mr. Hunt had called him, he knew how to distinguish *honesty* from *perfidy*—young as he was, he knew how to distinguish *impudence* from *courage*, and young as he was, he could discern a false friend of the public from their sincere and honest advocates [cries of "Bravo," and "Give it him, Hobhouse," "How the blacking spills."] When Mr. Hunt talked of his (Mr. Hobhouse's) father being a sinecurist, he would ask whether Mr. Hunt, in his manner of introducing the subject, displayed either decency or delicacy, and whether that had *any thing to do with the business of the day?* How many families were there, in which the members of them were *obliged to entertain different opinions?* He could, however, tell Mr. Hunt, that what he had said was *false*, and it was as *false as himself*, and as *false as his conduct had been to the people*—[hear; cries of "There's courage, my boy!"]—for never had his father received a farthing for *doing nothing*. He could tell the Meeting with truth, that not one farthing had his father *received out of the public pocket*. [Cheers]. He would, however, give them the particulars, and for entering into which he hoped they would excuse him—[cries of "Yes, yes."] The Creditors of one of the Indian States had agreed, that if the East India Company would advance them some money, they would allow a portion of it to be paid for collecting the debts and carrying the arrangement into effect. He must therefore ask,

was it a sinecure when his father had done his duty as a Commissioner of the Indian estates, and he had *laboured* as much as any man breathing in the discharge of the duty attached to the office? He would again repeat to Mr. Hunt that his argument was false, that it was false as Hunt himself, and as *false as Hunt* had proved himself to the people of this country [bravo, bravo]. After this specimen of Mr. Hunt's *honesty* and *truth* in his conduct towards his (Mr. Hobhouse's) father and himself, he would ask the Meeting whether they wished him there again? [Cries of "No, no! we don't want him, let him go and sell his roasted corn."] What the individual wished to do, he had done; he had defeated the object of the Meeting, *by nullifying the Petition*; and the members of the Meeting would go home humiliated and *crest fallen* [here the crowd loudly vociferated "We did not understand the motion; *put the House and Window Tax again*"]. Mr. Hunt has had his turn in being heard; he (Mr. Hobhouse) had listened to him, and perhaps they would hear no more of sinecurists. As the Meeting had, by their proceedings this day, determined *not to petition Parliament for a repeal of the House and Window Taxes* [loud calls, of "Put the House and Window Tax again; *we want them repealed*"], he felt it right to tell the Meeting, that he had given notice of an intention, after the Easter vacation, to *move for a repeal of those odious and infamous taxes*. He did not know whether it would be attended with a favourable result or not, but he hoped it might. He had heard it hinted lately that Ministers intended to repeal these taxes, though not this year; it was to be done next year, and he would tell them why—because Ministers intended to appeal to the British public, by dissolving Parliament; and they thought that by such a measure, which must be fresh in the mind of every person, they might gain the favour of the people [hear,

hear!]. He should, however, persevere in his duty, feeling that the approbation of the country, and more particularly his constituents, would go with him; consequently that Mr. Hunt's censure would also follow. [Loud and repeated cheers.]

Mr. Presland wished to move a vote of censure against Mr. Hunt, but the friends of Mr. Hunt were clamorous, and it was withdrawn. Thanks were then voted to the High Bailiff, for his excellent conduct in the Chair, and he was about to return thanks, but was prevented by the multitude, who desired the Petition to be again put to the vote. The principal Members, however, had left the platform, and the Meeting was dissolved. Loud groans and hisses were directed against Mr. Hunt, as he was quitting the boards. He received all, however, in good part. When he was about to descend the steps, some angry words passed between the opposite parties. One individual challenged Mr. Hunt to fight, and placed himself in a sparring attitude. Mr. Birt, his friend, demanded the card of another, but that person held his fist in his face, and told him that *that was his card*, and he would fight him on the stage as a gentleman. Some persons, however, interfered, and Mr. Hunt and his friend left the platform, and walked down the Piazzas, followed by an immense mob, in the direction of Drury-lane, where we left him.

Here, then, Catholics of Ireland, the real *public spoke* as to two things, and those of the greatest importance. First, you see, that when Mr. HUNT, and, afterwards, Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, expressed a desire, that *Catholic emancipation should take place*, the whole meeting *applauded!* There was no division of opinion

here. *All were for emancipation.*

Where, then, are those, who said, at the opening of the session, that "the people of England were *not ripe* for Catholic emancipation?"

This gives to those persons a flat contradiction. This shows, that the mass of the intelligent people of England are *for you*; and this is worth ten thousand times as much for you as all that "your able friends" in parliament ever did, or ever will do, for your cause.

Then come public opinion as to the two pretty "*wings*." The newspapers hate Mr. HUNT, because, I presume, he does not *pay them*. The Westminster Rump have a close connexion with the newspapers. Part of this Rump are proprietors in the newspaper *Joint-Stock Companies*, especially in those which would grant to Ireland *barrenness in the women*, in order to make them and their husbands *happy*. Therefore, you are not to be surprised, that they represent Mr. HUNT as having been *hooted by the meeting*; as having been held in scorn by them; and as having been proved to be so very unpopular; while they represent Sir FRANCIS and Mr. HOBHOUSE as having been *applauded to the skies!*

But you, though "*wild Irish*,"

are, surely, not so very "wild" as not to possess some small portion of common sense. And, does it require any large portion of this commodity to convince you of the misrepresentations in this respect? However, laying aside all other matter, what are the undeniable facts of this case? They are these: That there was a meeting of the Electors of Westminster, called for the purpose of petitioning for a repeal of the house and window taxes, a burden of which they are very anxious to get rid;—that a Committee, with whom Sir FRANCIS BURDETT and Mr. HOBHOUSE had co-operated, came forward, with those two along with them, and proposed to the Meeting certain resolutions, on which to found a petition;—that Mr. HUNT (one of the electors) came upon the hustings, and proposed, before the resolutions were put, to ADD TO THEM a resolution against paying the Catholic Clergy out of the taxes, and also against disfranchising the Irish freeholders;—that this resolution of Mr. HUNT was PASSED BY THE MEETING;—that, notwithstanding this, a petition, brought, cut and dry, by Sir FRANCIS and his Rump, was put to the Meeting, leaving out Mr. HUNT's resolution, which the

Meeting had voted should be added to the other resolutions;—that Mr. HUNT complained of this leaving out, called it (what it was) a most gross insult to the Meeting, and advised the Meeting to reject the Petition altogether, if the matter of his resolution were not included in it;—that, now, one of the BURDETT and HOBHOUSE faction proposed to put it to the vote, whether Mr. HUNT's resolution should be included in the Petition, or not;—that this question was put, and that, though the cry of "NO, NO," was instantly raised, the show of hands was in favour of Mr. Hunt's resolution;—that, after the resolution of Mr. HUNT had, thus, been TWICE put to and agreed to by the Meeting, the Petition was put, without that resolution, and was NEGATIVED by the Meeting!

Was there ever any thing more decisive than this? Was there ever a fouler attempt to mislead the people? Did people ever show more good sense and more public spirit? Was ever foul play more justly and more signally punished? HOBHOUSE, in venting the rage with which he was choaking, said, that the people would "go home crest-fallen." Dear little cock! It was he and his master that had got the cut on

the comb. The people had done their duty; they had shown, as Mr. HUNT called on them to show, "the spirit of Englishmen"; they had passed a resolution; they TWICE passed it; and, those who meant to juggle them out of their senses, those who thought to make mere tools of them, still put the petition without that resolution; and then the people said, "keep your petition to yourselves, for we reject it." Thus, the people of Westminster resolved, that they would continue to pay house and window tax, rather than not express their hostility to the two wings, of which SIR FRANCIS BURDETT is the patron, if not the papa.

SIR FRANCIS BURDETT's complaint, that the Committee had not previously had Mr. HUNT's resolution submitted to them is curious enough. So, then, it is a Committee that is to settle on what is to pass, and the Meeting is a mere farce; a mere thing for show; a mere mockery. Suppose any man out in the Meeting were to propose an amendment to a proposed petition. Is his proposition not to be put to the Meeting, merely because the Committee has not, or do not, approve of it? Such a Meeting is a despicable farce; and such have all the

Meetings in Westminster been since the RUMP has had the leading-strings in their hands. These leading-strings are broken. I said, the other day, that, if any one man would come forth at a Westminster Meeting, he would show, in a moment, that these cajolers were nothing.

HOBHOUSE's insolence to Mr. HUNT is not seen in its true light, unless we remember, that the latter is held under heavy recognizances to keep the peace! The little cocky seems to have been half mad; and well he might. The fact of his father having enjoyed a most fat public office, for so many years, that the father was at the "CRIB," as SIR FRANCIS called it, while the son was bawling out against taxes, was pretty well; but, the cock-a-doodle had given notice of a motion, in the big House, for a repeal of the House and Window Tax. It has been observed, that he was "running mute" this Session; and this motion was to enable him to "open" with eclat. He wanted a petition from Westminster to hold in his hand, and to open upon; and, there he now is, not only without such petition; but, with a vote of his own constituents against such a petition, because it did not contain a resolution against that dis-

franchisement of freeholders, of which disfranchisement his political papa was the patron!

Sad dilemma! He was obliged to give up his petition, or carry in, and present to the House, a condemnation of the projects and new principles that he knew his colleague and patron had adopted and was bound to support. The dilemma of the patron was still more distressing; for he was compelled to see the petition thrown aside; or, to carry into the House (as he must along with his man) a document, in which *his own conduct was condemned by his constituents!* These two must make a fine figure when they come forth upon these two subjects. Mr. ROBINSON will refer the *man* to the vote of his constituents, and Mr. PEEL will do the same by *master*. They thought, that the RUMP had prepared a *snug* Meeting for them; and, we can easily account for their rudeness and their rage.

It is said, in the above report, that the people cried out, "We *did not understand it: put the petition again.*" Why did they not *do this?* They knew they dared not. A motion was made for *censure* on Mr. HUNT; but but, *what!* Why "Mr. HUNT's friends were cla-

morous, and the motion was *withdrawn.*" Oh! then, Mr. HUNT had "*friends*" at the Meeting! And, which is still more surprising, they were a *majority*; for, they being "*clamorous*," the motion was "*withdrawn.*" The fact is, that Mr. HUNT had no *particular friends* in the crowd. He came before them to put their opinions to the test: the Meeting had been got up by *Burdett, Hobhouse*, and their *Rump Committee*: they, indeed, had prepared a *group of bawlers*, and from these came all the opposition that Mr. HUNT experienced. The *show of hands* is the fairest thing in the world. In that there can be very little undue influence. It was *impossible*, that Mr. HUNT could have an undue influence on the Meeting; this was impossible; and, therefore, the conclusion is, that the *public*, in England, are *for* Catholic Emancipation, and against disfranchising the poor freeholders of Ireland.

So much for the *Westminster Meeting*, and *public opinion* in England. Such is the proof, that the people of England are "*not ripe* for the measure of emancipation." I always have said, that CORRUPTION would never be able to raise a cry of "*No Popery*" again. I have all along said this;

and now it is proved to be true. I challenged CORRUPTION to call a public-meeting: the false and savage old hag took good care not to do it: nay, I have heard, and I believe it to be true, that "Westminster's pride and England's glory" was applied to for the purpose of calling a Westminster Meeting to petition for unqualified emancipation for the Catholics of Ireland; and that he refused to have any thing to do with it: in short, that he prevented such meeting being called. See, then, how things work! A meeting is called, he is contriving the proceedings with his Committee; but, comes a man, as it were from the clouds; turns the meeting into a Catholic-question meeting; this meeting is for Catholic emancipation, and against blasting it with the "wings" that the baronet had contrived, or adopted!

Another striking proof of the death of "No Popery" is, that those words have been written in chalk on all the walls in and leading into London: but, in every instance, other writers have gone, turned the first P into an R, and in most cases, the second P into a B. So that it is now "No Robbery," which does very well indeed; for, it is Robbery, and

not Popery, that makes the labouring people such miserable objects as they are. When the second P is left unaltered, it is "No Ropery" which is not bad, as it may mean, "no hanging." Thus, with that good humour, for which the English people are so famous, this great bugbear is turned into a subject of laughter. I dare say, now, that Mr. CHARLES BUTLER will ascribe this great change entirely to the efforts of those "powerful friends," of whom he and others talked at an English Catholic Meeting, held last fall, when a proposition to make me a present of Dr. LINGARD'S History was withdrawn, lest it should give offence to those "powerful friends." Mr. BUTLER, who had been labouring, he said, forty years in the vineyard of Emancipation, will, I will engage, ascribe no part of this change to me. No matter; I shall work on to the end of my "PROTESTANT REFORMATION," and leave Mr. CHARLES BUTLER to ascribe even that, if he choose, to his "most powerful friends."

We now come to the debate, in the House of Commons, on Monday last, when Mr. SPRING RICE presented a petition from certain Protestant landholders of Ireland, in favour of the Bill and

its "wings." You will, my friends, read this report with great attention. Here you have the substance of all that will ever be said, in the House, upon the subject. Pray pay attention to the whole of it; and when you have done that, I shall have to beg of you to hear the remarks that I have to make on it.

Mr. Spring Rice rose to present a Petition from a great number of highly respectable Protestants in Ireland, possessing among them *landed property to the amount of at least two hundred thousand pounds a year*. These petitioners were chiefly individuals who had *hitherto been among the most steady and faithful opposers of the Catholic claims*. The result, however, of their further experience and observation upon the subject, was, that they now came forward, declared their satisfaction that Parliament had taken the disqualifications of the Roman Catholics of Ireland into consideration, and expressed their hope that those disqualifications, which they were now convinced were most prejudicial to the peace and prosperity of Ireland, would be removed. In addition to this general declaration on the part of the petitioners, a further duty had been imposed upon him (Mr. Spring Rice), by some of the subscribers to the Petition, who, while they were prepared to express their hearty concurrence in the expedience of the Bill which had been already introduced into the House, instructed him to say, that the success of that Bill would afford them greater satisfaction *if it were accompanied by two other measures—namely, a measure affecting the qualifications of forty-shilling freeholders in Ireland, and a measure to secure a provision for the Catholic Clergy in Ireland*. In these points

he most heartily concurred with them, and should such measures be introduced into that House, they should have from him all the support which he could possibly give them. He could not help flattering himself with the belief, that the circumstances of the present time were much more favourable for the success of the great question of Catholic Emancipation than they had ever been at any former period. The Catholic Association having been put an end to by Parliament, an act of grace, such as the concession of the claims, would be received with feelings of peculiar satisfaction by the Catholics themselves. Many of the Catholic leaders had also been in this country; and a number of those who had hitherto been stanch opponents of the Catholic Question had had an opportunity of conversing with them, and of weighing and examining their opinions and principles; and he was persuaded that he spoke but the truth, when he said that this intercourse had made the most favourable impression on those who had been most hostile to the Catholic claims. The examination of the Catholic gentlemen in the Committees had likewise a considerable effect in removing prejudice and inspiring confidence. One word more: if he could believe that what was called raising the qualifications of the present forty-shilling freeholders could have the effect of checking the popular feeling of the country, or of diminishing the strength of popular principles among the peasantry and the small land-owners of Ireland, it should not have his concurrence. But it was because he knew (he did not say he believed, but knew) that it would be a most wise, salutary, and popular reform of the constituent body in Ireland, that he was determined to support it. Its tendency would be to increase the control over the representative body, and to render that body more amenable to public opinion. This very measure, which those who were deficient in local knowledge

maintained would trench upon popular right, he was convinced would materially strengthen it, would excite dormant energies, and would, as he had already observed, effect a most just, wise, and salutary improvement in the character of the constituent body without the doors, and of the representative body within them.

On the motion for bringing up the Petition,

Mr. Littleton expressed the satisfaction which he felt at the sentiments which had just fallen from the Hon. Gentleman, and took the present opportunity of giving notice, that as soon as the Bill, which was already in the House, should have passed (for he had no doubt it would pass) the second reading, he would propose a measure for the regulation of the elective franchise in Ireland. Whether he should propose that measure in the shape of a separate Bill, or of a clause in the Bill now in progress through the House, was a question which he was not yet prepared to answer. But in neither case would he make any proposition, the effect of which would be to trench on any existing privileges. It would be entirely prospective in its character, and would in no way touch the right of voting where it was at present practically existing. He was not disposed at present to say to what amount of property he would recommend that the qualification for voting should be raised; but he conceived that it ought to be to some sum not less than 5*l.* and not more than 10*l.* It was not because he himself thought that the concessions to the Catholics ought to be accompanied by any securities that he intended to make this proposition. He had always held that Catholic Emancipation would carry with it its own security. But although he yielded to no man in his wish that the benefits of the British Constitution should be thrown open to all classes of His Majesty's subjects without difficulty or hesitation, he felt bound to respect the conscientious scruples of those

who required some securities before they could satisfy their own minds as to the expediency of granting those benefits to His Majesty's Catholic subjects; and he knew that there was a large proportion of the Protestant population of this country who considered some regulations respecting the elective franchise in Ireland as an indispensable accompaniment to Catholic concession.

Mr. M. A. Taylor said, that as the Honourable Member for Staffordshire had not gone into any details with respect to his proposed measure, it was not his intention to enter into any discussion on the subject. But he begged leave to say a few words, merely to enter his protest, in the first instance, against the proposition, in order that he might not hereafter be charged with inconsistency respecting it. He asked pardon of the House for speaking for a moment of himself, but having had the honour of a seat in Parliament for between thirty and forty years, he had pledged himself to the maintenance of certain principles from which he should certainly not now depart. Many years ago, and at different times, he had expressed himself in favour of Catholic Emancipation. For the Bill in progress through the House he had voted, because the best friends of the peace and prosperity of England and Ireland thought it indispensable. But what was the state of things now? He had never until that moment been told, that in order to procure Catholic Emancipation we must have a Reform of the Representation of Ireland, and must pay the Catholic Clergy of Ireland out of the funds of England. To the proposition of paying the Catholic Clergy he should have no objection, if means could be devised for doing so out of the funds of Ireland, and if the Gentlemen of Ireland chose so to apply these means. But after the number of years in which he had been employed in that House, in endeavouring to keep down the taxation of those who had sent him there, and to di-

minish their burdens, he did not understand being called upon to pay two hundred and thirty or two hundred and forty thousand pounds for Catholic Emancipation as a kind of boon, when he had been all along told that it was so desirable a measure. With what face could he, who had for so many years laboured to reduce taxation, acquiesce in such a proposition; Although he was a strict Protestant, and a Church of England Protestant, he had dissented from the vote for giving money to build new churches? not because he did not wish to see new churches built, but because, as he had told the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Committee, he thought the expense ought to be defrayed by the congregations, and not by the public at large. After such a proceeding, with what face could he consent to tax his constituents for the maintenance of the Irish Roman Catholic Clergy? He never would do so; and were he the only individual in the House hostile to such a proposition, he would persevere in his opposition to it. With respect to the other proposal, for interfering with the Representation of Ireland, the nature of it was directly adverse to the principles which he had all his life been advocating. Was he not one of the Friends of the People in 1793? (A laugh.) He had always been for extending, not for limiting, the right of voting. *If a forty-shilling qualification were considered as too small for an elector in Ireland, what was to prevent its being considered as too small for an elector in England? But how would such a proposition be relished in this country?* He thought himself as good a voter in the county of Durham as any man, and yet his qualification did not exceed 3*l*. [A laugh.] Yet such a proposition as that of the Honourable Member for Staffordshire would destroy all such qualifications. Look at many of our tenures. Look at the practice of Knare-borough, where the burgesses voted with a wet seal. Was it not, indeed, the practice of all bur-

gage tenures to vote with a wet seal? All these might as well be disturbed as the elective franchise of the forty-shilling freeholders in Ireland. He was extremely sorry at the introduction of this proposition. Had the Bill gone on as it was going on, it must have triumphed in that House, and after two or three Sessions the other House would have found it impossible longer to withstand the general opinion in its favour. But he would now tell the Honourable Member for Staffordshire, that if he meant success to Catholic Emancipation (and he did not doubt that he earnestly wished it), he had taken the very worst course that could possibly be adopted for obtaining that object.

Sir R. Shaw was persuaded, that nothing was so likely to *conciliate the minds of the Protestants of Ireland as the proposed alteration in the elective franchise*, and the proposed provision for the Roman Catholic Clergy. He had received a number of letters from Ireland, all concurring in the opinion, that if those two measures were agreed to, the opposition to the Catholic Emancipation Bill would be almost entirely done away with.

Sir J. Newport was anxious on all occasions to state fully and frankly his opinions upon the various questions that were brought before that House; and he was, of course, especially solicitous to do so with reference to that vitally important measure, notice of a proposition respecting which had just been given by the Hon. Member for Staffordshire. He felt peculiar anxiety on this subject, because he was convinced in his own mind, that the Hon. Gentleman's proposition would tend materially to facilitate the progress of the measure of which he (Sir J. Newport) had been for twenty-three years in the House, and forty years out of the House, the unceasing advocate. If he had failed to convince the House that he was *warmly attached to the real freedom of election*, and exceedingly desirous to maintain the substantial

rights of the people, down to the lowest ranks in society, he had for many years been labouring in vain. But when the Hon. Member for Durham said that he believed the Catholic Question would triumph in two or three Sessions, without these injurious appendages, as he termed them: he (Sir J. Newport), who knew something more of Ireland than the hon. Gentleman, (Hear, hear), begged leave to tell him, that the consequences of deferring the Emancipation were not to be calculated. When the hon. Gentleman talked of not burdening his constituents with 240,000*l.* a year for the purpose of providing for the Catholic Clergy, he (Sir John Newport) begged to ask him if he should think it a better plan to pay three millions a year for soldiers? [Hear, hear!] It was utterly impossible to believe, that so great a portion of the community could remain in a state of serious discontent, aggravated by various considerations, without giving occasion for large and continued expense. It was highly momentous that the question should undergo a speedy, and, as he trusted, a favourable decision. The present was, perhaps, the most fortunate period for such a decision that could possibly occur. Parliament had a mass of evidence before them to show the evils of the present system. They had before them the opinions of the Protestants of Ireland, as well as of the leaders of the Catholics. Let them seize the golden opportunity. Let them not allow it to pass by. Former favourable opportunities had been permitted to slip; let not the present be added to the number. There was at present a concurrence of fortunate events, the continuance of which could not possibly be anticipated; and unless advantage was taken of them to adopt means of permanently tranquillizing Ireland, the most incalculable evils must be expected. With respect to the contemplated change in the elective franchise, he was bold to say, that whenever that subject came regularly

under discussion, he should be able to prove, to the satisfaction of the most incredulous, that the elective franchise in the hands of many of those who now hold it in Ireland, so far from being a boon, was pregnant with the most injurious consequences. They were not free agents. They might be called freeholders or free electors; but the term "free" was misapplied. They were driven or dragged to the hustings to do, not what they wished themselves, but what their superiors wished.

Mr. S. Wortley expressed his regret at what had fallen from the Hon. Member for Durham. He was in hopes that the proposition of his Honourable Friend, the Member for Staffordshire, would have met with unanimous support. He entreated his Hon. Friend, however, not to be deterred by any threatened opposition; for he believed in his conscience that the House would pass the Emancipation Bill, together with his Honourable Friend's proposition; and he trusted that a great majority would be found on that side of the question.

Sir R. Wilson observed, that when he voted for Catholic Emancipation, it was with a view of increasing, not of decreasing the rights and privileges of the Catholics of Ireland. If any abuses existed in the Representation of Ireland, let a Committee be appointed to investigate them. To that extent he was quite ready to go. He was ready to correct all abuses—to make fallacious voters, if such there were, substantial. But further he could not go. He must continue to maintain the Act of the 33d of Geo. III., by which the Catholics were permitted to enjoy the elective franchise. He would oppose all measures which contemplated any alteration, where the votes were bona fide registered.

Lord John Russell spoke in so low a tone of voice as to be very indistinctly audible in the gallery. We understood the Noble Lord, however, to say, that he considered the raising of the qualification, and the

provision for the Catholic Clergy, as so *infinitely small a price* for the great benefit of Catholic emancipation, that he would not delay the measure a single moment by declining to pay it.

Sir Francis Burdett felt it incumbent upon him to say, that he did not altogether concur in the sentiments that he had just heard; but, notwithstanding what had been urged against the proposed measures, with respect to the modification of the voting in Ireland, he was *still of opinion that the projected alteration relative to the Irish forty shilling freeholders would be beneficial*. With reference to the measure for providing stipends for the Catholic Clergy, he should be disposed to give an equally decided support to that proposition. The subject of expense had been dwelt upon by Honourable Gentlemen; but nothing that had been said with relation to expense was calculated to turn the balance in his mind one way or the other. This was not an abstract question, but one connected with present interests and sentiments, and he should like to know upon what terms the Government support to Catholic Emancipation could be obtained. He was *ready to make great sacrifices* to obtain the Emancipation of the Catholics. There were certain misconceptions which had been put forth in relation to Mr. O'Connell, which *ought in justice to that Gentleman to be removed*. It had been stated that the Committee had not delegated to Mr. O'Connell the power to draw up the Bill. The fact was, that Mr. O'Connell was induced to draw up a rough sketch of the Bill, which had given satisfaction to a *body of Gentlemen*, not of the Committee, but *who had assembled in order to ascertain the sentiments of the Irish people upon the subject*. Mr. O'Connell had not, therefore, drawn up the Bill for the Committee, as had been stated to the public.

Mr. Peel stated, that it was not his wish to provoke any discussion

upon the question, but he wished the course he intended to take to be perfectly clear, and well understood. He had no hesitation to state, that he *could not accept of the present measure as a compromise*; and the proposed plans of disfranchising the forty shilling voters, and of making a state provision for the clergy, *would not induce him to relax his opposition to the pretensions of the Catholics*. But it was possible that his opinions upon the Catholic claims might be overruled, and then the question would be, what course he should pursue in endeavouring to modify future proceedings. Upon this point he must declare that his mind was not made up, and the question involved many collateral considerations. In the present state of the question, he should declare that he could not accept of the present measure as a compromise for withdrawing his opposition to the Catholic claims.

Mr. Tierney was anxious to know whether the adoption of this measure would be *received as a compromise*, by those who were the opponents of Catholic emancipation? If it were to be so received, he was ready to declare that he would give it his support.

Mr. Brownlow stated, that he had held an extensive correspondence upon the subject with several gentlemen in Ireland, whose opinions in relation to this measure were extremely valuable. These gentlemen had stated that, in their opinion, the present plan of making provision for the Catholic Clergy, would *tend to reconcile the Protestants of Ireland to the emancipation of the Catholics*. For his part, whether the question was carried or not, it did appear to him to be nothing more than a beneficial measure, to establish a Legislative provision for the Catholic Priesthood, many of whom were now in a state little better than that of begging their bread. With respect to what was called an Elective Franchise, the term, in his opinion, was

most improperly applied. The forty shilling voters in Ireland, in respect to elections, were in a state of absolute slavery, and the whole system of their voting at elections was *objectionable in the extreme*.

Mr. C. Grant conceived that the most important point in relation to the Catholic claims now before the House, was the situation of the Catholic Priests, and of the 40s. voters. The situation of these two classes principally contributed to the unfortunate situation of the Irish landlord. The footing upon which the Irish voters had been placed in 1793, had been most destructive of the real freedom of Ireland.

Mr. Laneson stated that he had been induced to alter many of his opinions by what had passed in the Committee. Gentlemen, in discussing the loss and gains of the Catholics by the proposed measure, had overlooked what would be the effect of the present plan upon the Protestants. The Protestants would not be so well satisfied as many Gentlemen supposed at being deprived of their *elective franchise*, and the present measure would be far from giving satisfaction in the northern parts of Ireland.

Mr. W. Courtenay regretted that such a Petition should have been presented to the House. Many of his constituents were *friendly to the granting of the Catholic claims*; but the question was, whether the adoption of the two measures would tend to *cure the fears of those who apprehended evils from the concessions to the Catholics*. He much doubted whether the proposed alterations with respect to the Irish freeholders would have the anticipated effect.

The Petition was then brought up and ordered to be printed.

First, you will observe, that Mr. Rice's petitioners are great *Protestant landlords*, who have always *heretofore been the most edy opponents of the Catholic*

"claims"; but, now, if they can but get money paid to the Catholic Clergy, and get the small freeholders disfranchised, are most eager to grant the claims!

What do we want more than this to show us, that these projects are intended to counteract the effect of the emancipation? What do we want more, unless we be natural fools, to convince us, that, in the opinion of these great Protestant landlords, the *'Squirarchy* of Ireland, the Catholics would lose more by the wings than they would gain by the body of this famous project? That is a point settled in their minds; and, when to this conduct of theirs we add the decidedly expressed opinion of Dr. DOYLE, that emancipation would be a loss, if accompanied with a disfranchisement of the 40s. freeholders. Yes, that he knows well; and the ORANGEMEN know it too; and, therefore, these latter petition for emancipation; pray, good, kind souls, that their Catholic countrymen may be emancipated, and not only emancipated, but receive the additional benefit of *disfranchisement*! "Well," as Mr. O'CONNELL says, "believe me, they are much better men than our passions had allowed us to believe them"! Was ever delusion so great; and was it ever effected by impositions so gross!

Mr. SPRING RICE is, you see, a thorough-paced reformer of the *Burdett school*. He, good, staunch reformer, is quite convinced, that the voters and the members will both be the better for the disfranchisement. He thinks, too, that the popular voice will be made the louder by the silencing of ninety-nine hundredths of those who utter that voice! "Blessed

man!" as Henry VIII. said to CRANMER, when he told him, that he would find out the means of ridding him of his wife, which you will remember was also a sort of "*wing*" to the Protestant Reformation, and to *relieve* CATHERINE from her crown was much about such a measure as that of *relieving* the Catholic freeholders of their votes.

Then comes Mr. LITTLETON, who tells us, that a "large part" of the *Protestants in this country* look upon a regulation as to "the freeholders of Ireland as *indispensable* to the granting of "emancipation." It makes one laugh to hear all these contradictory opinions from men who support the same measure. But, where, Mr. LITTLETON, do you find this "*large part*" of the English Protestants? *Where* are they? We have heard the people of *Westminster*; and they say, that they will continue to pay house and window tax, rather than consent to the "*wings*." And, what part of the people of England has said the contrary? Show us that "*large part*" that wants to see the Irish freeholders disfranchised.

However, Mr. LITTLETON, if I understand his words, does not mean to *disfranchise* any body. He means to propose a law to prevent poor freeholders from being *created in future*. That is quite *another thing*. But, then, what will that do for Mr. LITTLETON's "*large part*" who look upon this lopping of 40s. freeholders as "*indispensable* to emancipation"? Good God! *Where* are all these contradictions to end? This "*monstrous evil*," as the friends of the measure pretend, is

to have no sensible diminution for *several years to come*. How, then, is it to give *security* to the Protestants? And then, mind, the *Protestants of Ireland* are to undergo the *same diminution* as to voters; and is that too calculated to give the *Protestants security*?

SIR JOHN NEWPORT likes real freedom at elections, even down to the *lowest ranks*; but, the rights of the poor freeholders of Ireland are, he says, *no rights at all*; they are driven to the poll like *cattle*, and to take the vote from them would be to *release them from slavery*. But, Sir John, *who* is it that *drives* them? When cattle are driven, there must be a *driver*. Now these drivers are the very men, who, at this moment, *petition for the disfranchisement*; and *why*; because they know, that they *cannot* drive them, *even now*, in all cases; and because they fear, that, if emancipation were to come, they would *not be able to drive them at all*. That is the truth, Sir John. You told Mr. MICHAEL ANGELO TAYLOR, that you *knew Ireland rather better than he*. Very likely; but, he knows, as well as you, that two and two make four; and that proposition is not a more evident truth, than, that the *drivers* of cattle would not pray to have the cattle put an end to, if the existence of the cattle were not, in some way or other, *inconvenient* to those drivers. Some of these "*cattle*" have sent an address to Mr. LAWLESS (which I insert below, with his answer), and, it seems, that in one parish, at any rate, the "*cattle*" have a sense of their danger. But, again I say, if this measure be a *good to the Catholics*, in addition to

emancipation, what will Mr. LITTLETON's "large part of Protestants" say to it? They who want it to *counteract* the effects of *good to the Catholics?*

Of the other "*wing*," the payment of the Catholic clergy, Sir JOHN NEWPORT said, that we should reflect, that we must pay 230,000*l.* to *priests*, or 3,000,000*l.* (three millions) a year to *soldiers*! This is simply a repetition of what Sir FRANCIS BURDETT said at the *Westminster Meeting*, only that the latter put the whisker-expense at *four millions*. And here we have a compliment to the Catholic priests and their religion quite equal to that of their other "*able friend*" of the *Morning Chronicle*. This latter would pay the priests out of the taxes, in order to prevent them from *prostituting the Sacrament of Marriage purely for the sake of the fees*, which he says they *now do*, and thus add to the population of the country, instead of letting the people remain single, and letting there be "*more bastards*," as he says, the "*more prudent*" Scotch have. This is his compliment to the Catholic religion and its priests. Sir JOHN and Sir FRANCIS would pay the priests out of the taxes, in order to save the greater expense of *an army*; that is to say, then, the influence of the priests is now employed to *cause discontents and insurrections*, or, it is *not employed to prevent them*; and that, if you will but *give the priests money*, they will employ their influence to keep the people quiet, and will suffer you to take away the people's elective franchise into the bargain; and that, too, though Dr. DOYLE has said, that *emancipation is nothing in value compared with that*

franchise! The Catholics are fortunate in "*able friends*," as Mr. CHARLES BUTLER called them. Such compliments were never, surely, before paid to any set of men upon earth: Sir FRANCIS here surpasses the compliments he paid to the unhappy *millers of Isleworth*.

If such were the character of Irish Catholic Priests, if they really did prostitute their sacred office in *urging people to marry merely for the sake of the fees*; if they did *employ their influence over their flocks to urge them to act so as to make an army necessary to keep them down, knowing that the poor creatures were rushing on destruction*; if this were true, where is the honest man in the whole world who would not say, give them, not *money*, but a *halter*? It is NOT TRUE: it is a *falsehood most malignant*. The whole of Christendom cannot produce a body of men so truly pious and diligent and disinterested as the Catholic Priests of Ireland. They have never discovered a love of money. Their works of piety and charity have been incessant. They are the very best body of Clergy that was ever known; and is not this proved by their *fruits*? What but their real goodness is it that has, in spite of ages upon ages of the most horrible persecutions, caused the Catholic religion to continue the religion of Ireland, and that has, at last, nearly extinguished the flocks of the Protestant Church, though its Clergy possess revenues to the amount of three millions a year, and though the Catholics are invited to join it by all the allurements of emoluments and honours! Here is a

complete answer to all the "*able*" and calumniating "*friends*," who now propose to pay that Clergy out of the taxes, and whose real hope (a vain one) is, that they shall, by giving them *money*, seduce them from their duty to God and to the flocks committed to their charge, and make them the tools of the Orangemen.

MR. BROWNLOW, who, it will be remembered, was the advocate of the ORANGE SOCIETIES, and who is at no pains to disguise his hostility to concessions to the Catholics, is for paying the Catholic Clergy. And he, too, cries out against the 40s. freeholders; and says, that to do them away "would go far towards reconciling the Protestants of Ireland to emancipation." And will any one, after this, pretend to believe that the existence of those freeholders is an *evil to the Catholics*? Is there any one so debased as to affect to believe that the measure of disfranchisement would *benefit the Catholic cause*? SIR JOHN NEWPORT may know "rather more about Ireland" than MR. MICHAEL ANGELO TAYLOR does; but does he know more about it than MR. BROWNLOW does? And, particularly, does he know more about driving the "*cattle*" to the poll? Has not MR. BROWNLOW seen as much of that as SIR JOHN? Aye, has he; and, doubtless, he knows that they are not always so very *easy to drive*, and knows, too, that they would be still *more difficult* to drive, if emancipation were to take place; and, therefore, it is, that he very consistently says, that to reduce their numbers would "go far towards reconciling the Protestants of Ireland to emancipation."

MR. PEEL looked upon the two "*wings*" as the offer of *compensation* for emancipation, and said, honestly, that he, for his part, would *not receive* them as such. He, in short, gave no one ground to believe, that he had budged an inch; and, I dare say, that we shall find that he has not.

To be sure, he has now to deal with opponents, who are in such a plight as men never were before. MR. RICE likes "*wing*" No. 2, because it will make the people *more free, and give them more power*. MR. LITTLETON likes it, but does not mean it to take place *for years to come*, though a "*large part of the English Protestants think it an indispensable condition of emancipation*." SIR JOHN NEWPORT is for it, because it will be a *gain* to the voters, who are almost all Catholics. LORD JOHN RUSSELL is fond of it, because it is a *price paid for emancipation*. SIR FRANCIS BURDETT is in love with it, because, "*to have being to have*," the Catholics must *give up the franchise to have* emancipation. MR. TIERNEY would like it, if he were *sure*, that it would be received as a *compromise*. MR. BROWNLOW says it would *reconcile* him to emancipation. Thus are things got into a pretty jumble at last! The advocates of the "*wings*" may, however, be divided into two classes: those who look upon them as tending to *increase the Catholic influence*, and those who look upon them as tending to *diminish it*; and, to be consistent, both must vote *against* them; the former, because, being *Protestants*, they ought to oppose a measure which they think tends to produce Catholic predominance; and the latter, because,

being "*able friends*" of the Catholics, they ought to oppose a measure, which they think will make them worse off than they were before.

And thus ends this chapter of inconsistency and of confusion of principles and opinions. The LORDS will, I take it, as they frequently have done before, sweep the whole mass away into speedy oblivion, clear the stage for us, and leave us to begin anew; and, in this they will have the hearty approbation of every just and sensible man in the kingdom, and especially of those who most anxiously wish to see *full justice* done to the long-oppressed Catholics of Ireland.

It now remains for me to offer you some remarks upon the *treatment* that Mr. O'CONNELL has received here; and upon the CATHOLIC BILL as it now stands. This last topic, I must *postpone*, only observing, that I, if I were a member of Parliament, *would vote against that*, even if the wings had never been named. It imposes oaths, and particularly one oath, which reflect dishonour on the Catholic religion, and which no honourable Catholic will ever take. It is, therefore, fortunate for Mr. O'CONNELL, that the "*able friends*" have cleared him of all participation in the framing of *this* Bill. But, it would have been still more fortunate for him, if he had not been so ready to *confide* and to *praise*. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, who now comes out and says that Mr. O'CONNELL was requested by a BODY OF GENTLEMEN to draw the Bill, might have said this on the 23d of March, when he *silently* heard that, which was evidently calculated to hold Mr. O'CONNELL forth to the

world as having, in the most deliberate manner, promulgated a *falsehood*. Why, he was authorized to draw a Bill for Emancipation. If the Committee did not "*depute*" him to do it, "*a body of gentlemen*" did; amongst these was Sir FRANCIS BURDETT himself; and he was *one of the Committee*. How many others of the Committee were present he does not say; but, if there were only he, why did he not give this explanation the very moment that the attack was made? Mr. O'CONNELL has praised too much, has been over sanguine and too ready to confide; but, these are faults (if faults they be) arising from that generousness of disposition, which is honourable to the character of man. It will finally turn out, that he has been grossly deceived; but, where is there a man to say before the face of the world, that he would not rather be the deceived than the deceiver?

WM. COBBETT.

I have this moment seen an Advertisement for a "*hole-and-corner petition*" in Westminster. Defeated at the public meeting, the Burdett RUMP is getting signatures in *private houses*! What, is it come to this, at last? Will this be a petition such as Westminster used to send? And, is the Baronet fallen so low, as to imitate the boroughmongers at Maidstone? Sneak away from the face of the people, and juggle up a petition in private! He knows, that he *dares* not call another public meeting. He will meet his RUMP once more, perhaps, to celebrate "*purity of election*," with well-armed "*stewards*." But that, I take it, will be his last meeting. After that he will have plenty of time to hunt foxes.

To John Lawless, Esq.

SIR,—We the undersigned freeholders of the parish of Baldoyle, in the county of Dublin, registered at 40s. beg leave to address you, and to thank you for the noble exertion you made in support of our rights, in the attempt to deprive us by underhand means of the only right we possessed, and the opportunity of being once in seven years introduced to the gentry of the country, and asked by the Representatives in parliament for our county how we get on, and if we had any thing to complain of. At the last election we voted for the persons who we were told were the popular candidates, contrary, some of us, to the wishes of our landlords: we did this at the instance of persons whom we supposed our friends, and who we did not suspect would betray us. We have been deceived; we subscribed to the Catholic rent, we have been deceived; for the sums subscribed we gain a loss; in you now we place our confidence, and beg that you will do what you may think fit and proper on our behalf, to retain for us our rights, and not suffer us to be considered as outcasts in society. As to the Clergy, we have nothing to say; they will judge for themselves, and we hope properly. We beg of you, Sir, to present our everlasting gratitude and respect to that powerful advocate for the rights of man, Mr. Cobbett, for his very humane advocacy of our cause, and let him and his family have the best return we can offer—our blessings and prayers for their welfare and happiness. Some of us are of opinion that we ought to petition parliament; but as we do not know who to trust at present or consult, will you tell us what we ought to do, and send such a draft as you think would answer? We conclude by praying

long life for you, and may every happiness attend you.

MARTIN TRACY JOHN BURNE
BARNY MAGUIRE BRYAN TOOK
PAT. MURPHY MICH. NOLAN
TIM. DUNSEY PHIL. EAHILL
JOHN RYAN, ✕ his mark.
JOHN REILLY, for self and 40 others.

March 23, 1825.

Baldoyle, Co. Dublin.

To the Freeholders of the Parish of Baldoyle.

COUNTRYMEN,

THE Address which I have received this day from you far overpays me for any humble exertions I may have made, in support of the dearest and most valuable privilege man can enjoy—the privilege of giving his vote for his representative in parliament. I cannot understand that plan of Emancipation which robs the poor Irish Catholic of this proud and honourable privilege. Such a sacrifice is too dear a price for all the advantages which the Catholic aristocracy and gentry may possibly enjoy, from the forthcoming Bill of Emancipation. You will pardon me for differing with you in the opinion, that the men who propose the abolition of the 40s. freeholders in Ireland are actuated by corrupt or improper motives; it is an error in judgment; but I will admit a great error, and one which I trust reflection will correct, before the Legislature shall assemble again. It has been the boast and pride of my life to be the advocate, however feeble, of the rights of my poorer, though not less valuable, countrymen. I am more than rewarded by their good opinion, and shall endeavour to continue to deserve it. I remain, with sincere respect,

Your very sincere Friend,

JOHN LAWLESS.

Tavistock Hotel, London.

March 28th, 1825.

IF Mr. LAWLESS look upon the word "BETRAYED" as applying to the conduct of Mr. O'CONNELL, I agree with him; but, if he mean to speak *generally*, I disagree with him; for, that there has been *treachery somewhere* who can possibly deny? Mr. O'Connell was *deceived*; but, there must have been *somebody to deceive him*. These freeholders do themselves great honour; and they show that they are not the base slaves that they are represented to be.

THE FOLLOWING WAS SENT TO
THE TREASURY ON WEDNES-
DAY LAST.

TO THE
LORDS OF THE TREASURY.

*The Petition of William Cobbett,
dated this 30th day of March,
1825,*

Most humbly sheweth,

That your Petitioner has observed with great mortification, that, in the list of articles imported, from which articles a part of the present duties are intended to be deducted for the future, *Forest Seeds* are not included.

It is a fact perfectly well known, that there are many trees, which will grow to a large size in England; the timber of some of which is much more valuable than that of even our best oaks; the growth of which is, in this country, as rapid as in their native country; but, the *seeds* of some of which will seldom, and that of others never, come to perfection in England.

Is it, then, your humble Petitioner would beg leave to ask, wise to lay a heavy duty, and to

impede, by tormenting and most injurious regulations, the bringing of the seeds of these trees into the kingdom! Your humble Petitioner lately imported, through the port of London, 23 barrels and half-barrels of seeds; and the duties and charges *after landing*, amounted to *more than the original cost of the seeds, the oak barrels included*.

But, this additional cost was the least part of the injury. Many of the seeds required that they should come in *sand*. The whole contents of the barrels were turned out upon the wharf, or some other place, the seed sifted from the sand, in order, your humble Petitioner supposes, to weigh the seed. And then the contents were tumbled back again in a way that produced great injury to the seed. In some cases a *complete mixture of the seeds took place*; Apple pips with *red-cedar*; *tupiloe* with *dog-wood*; *white ash* with *sugar-maple*; *white cedar* with *black birch*. To separate these would cost more money, ten times over, than the whole of the seeds cost in America. The scrutiny was so rigorous, that your humble Petitioner thought it fortunate, that the several sorts of nuts were not cracked, in order to ascertain whether their shells did not cover contraband goods.

Your humble Petitioner, therefore, prays, that your Lordships will be pleased to recommend to the "Honourable House" to be so "*liberal*," in these days of "*liberality*" and "*prosperity*," as to include *Forest Seeds* amongst the articles, which are intended to be relieved from duty, and particularly to protect such seeds against the ransackings and tum-

blings and jumbings, which your most humble Petitioner's seeds have now to undergo.

And your Petitioner will ever most devoutly pray for long life, health and happiness to your Lordships.

WM. COBBETT.

GARDEN SEEDS AND FIELD SEEDS.

I HAVE received from *America* some very fine kidney beans. I expect some of the running kind. Those that I have at present are dwarfs. There are two sorts. The *Golden Dwarf*, and the *Blue and White Dwarf*. They are the finest and plumpest beans that I ever saw. They may be had at Fleet-street, four-pence a half-pint, seven-pence a pint, a shilling a quart, three and sixpence a gallon, and twenty shillings a bushel.

Swedish Turnip Seed and *Mangel Wurzel Seed*. I have some of the very best of both. The former is 1s. 3d. a pound, if ten pounds are taken; and 1s. 6d. if a less quantity. The latter, 2s. 3d. a pound, if ten pounds: and 2s. 6d. if less. I warrant them both, having grown them myself from picked and transplanted roots. Please to apply at No. 183, Fleet-street.

The *Swedish Turnip Seed* is of precisely the same sort as that, from which the *great crop*, mentioned in the Register some time ago, was grown in *Scotland*. And the *MANGEL WURZEL* seed is from

plants, some plants of which weighed not less than *thirty pounds* each, and the seed-stalks of which were more than *ten feet high*. The plants were all selected, and none planted for seed but those of the *deepest red*, which colour is a sure indication of the goodness of the sort. Those plants, the flesh of which is *white*, have degenerated.

N. B. Any gentleman, in *Ireland*, who may wish to be supplied with these seeds, will please to apply to Mr. SCULLY, Bookseller, Upper Orman Quay, Dublin, to whom I shall send some very shortly. The *Mangel Wurzel* should not be sown before *early in June*. If sown earlier, it is apt to go to seed the first year.

SPRING WHEAT. I have about 30 bushels, which I sell at 14s. a bushel, which is, as nearly as I can ascertain, what it cost me. This is the wheat for *bonnet-straw*. It may be sown till *May*. See *Cottage Economy*, last edition, paragraphs 224 to 227.

AMERICAN ALMANACK FOR 1824.

THOSE who have a mind to see how the "*fir frigates* with bits of striped bunting at their mast-heads" get on; those who have a mind to see what ships of the line, frigates, and so forth, Jonathan has prepared, and is preparing, for us; those who have a mind to see an account of the Navy, Army, Treasury, Imports, Exports, Navigation, Debt, Taxes, Revenue, Expenditure, and all other such

like matters appertaining to Jonathan, may have full information respecting them in a book under the above title, of which I have twenty-five copies to sell at the price of six shillings each copy; very neatly half-bound, and well printed upon good paper. I see that the exports from the United States, imported during the last year, amounted to 74,699,030 Spanish dollars, and that the imports amounted to 77,579,267 Spanish dollars; I also see that the American tonnage, entering into, and departing from, the United States, during the year, amounted to 1,086,032 tons. This is the amount of Jonathan's own tonnage. The foreign tonnage, during the same period, was 239,208 tons. There is at the end of the book what is called a General Statistical View of the Commerce of the United States. In short, this little book is a very useful one for any person who wishes to be acquainted with the wealth and various resources of the United States. I beg leave to recommend it to the attention and perusal of "my Lords" of the Admiralty, and particularly to that profound Statesman and Legislator, and most renowned Naval Commander, Sir JOSEPH YORKE,

Knight of the Order of the Bath. His worship will here see why it unfortunately happened that Mr. PRESIDENT MADISON remained *undeposed*, in spite of the speech attributed to his worship, and in spite of the exhortations and imprecations of that sensible vehicle, the *Old Times* newspaper.

GARDENING BOOK.

MY BOOK ON GARDENING is called the "*American Gardener*," and it was written for use in the *United States*. Two large editions have been sold *here*. But, it is now out of print, and I shall, in its stead, publish, in a few weeks, "*The English Gardener*." The other work was not adapted to *our seasons*; and, besides, it said nothing of *wall-trees*, which is a great subject with us, and of the *pruning* of which it is necessary to say *a great deal*; for, on it depends almost the whole of the success in getting fruit, and in getting it fine. On the subject of *grafting* and *budding*, and particularly on the subject of planting *orchards*, I have a great deal to say, that I think will be very useful.

MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending March 19.

Per Quarter.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat ..	68	1	Oats	24	1
Rye	39	7	Beans	37	7
Barley ..	40	2	Peas	40	4

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, March 19.

	Qrs.	£.	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat	6,662 for 24,098	10	4	Average, 72	4		
Barley	5,702....11,673	11	7	40	11	
Oats..	13,465....17,225	13	6	25	7	
Rye....	—	—	—	—	—	
Beans..	1,770....3,290	6	2	37	2	
Pease ..	640....1,287	0	5	40	2	

Friday, March 25.—The quantities of Corn that have arrived this week are small. The proposal of Government to admit Canada Wheat at a duty of 5s. per quarter has had a sensible effect on the minds of our millers; they at present appear entirely disinclined to purchase Wheat, and this trade is therefore reported lower for all except the finest samples. Barley has met a slow trade to-day at Monday's terms. Beans and Peas continue to sell heavily. The quantity of Oats for sale has de-

creased considerably within these few days, but this trade has not improved since Monday last.

Monday, March 26.—The arrivals of all sorts of Corn last week were moderate, and of Flour the quantity was not considerable. This morning there is only a short fresh supply of Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Peas, from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, and an inconsiderable supply of Oats from the North. The proposition of Government to admit Wheat from Canada at a duty of 5s. per quarter, and the intended motion on the Corn Laws, which stands for the 19th of April, have a tendency to keep the trade in a dull state. Prime Wheat still continues scarce, and finds buyers at last week's terms; but other sorts are dull, and 1s. to 2s. per qr. cheaper.

Barley has become extremely heavy in sale, and is declined 2s. per quarter. Beans, except very dry, go off slowly at declining rates. There are few Boiling Peas for sale, and they remain dull at last quotations. Grey Peas are also unaltered. The quantity of Oats for sale is not considerable, and there has been a slow sale for this article at the terms of this day se'nnight. The Flour trade is very dull.

Price on board Ship as under.

Flour, per sack	60s. — 65s.
—— Seconds	56s. — 60s.
—— North Country ..	52s. — 55s.

Account of Wheat, &c. arrived in the Port of London, from March 21 to March 26, both inclusive.

	Qrs.		Qrs.
Wheat ..	5,611	Tares	1,066
Barley ..	5,401	Linseed ..	300
Malt	7,792	Rapeseed..	51
Oats	5,712	Brank ..	40
Beans ...	2,076	Mustard ..	—
Flour	6,656	Flax	—
Rye	14	Hemp	—
Peas	912	Seeds ...	463

Foreign.—Wheat, 620; Barley, 2600; and Oats, 610 quarters.

Total Quantity of Corn returned as Sold in the Maritime Districts, for the Week ended March 19.

	Qrs.		Qrs.
Wheat ..	45,043	Oats	40,756
Rye	390	Beans ...	5,863
Barley ..	38,438	Peas	2,172

Monday, March 23.—The arrivals from Ireland last week were 482 firkins of Butter, and 595 bales of Bacon; and from Foreign Ports 5,939 casks of Butter.

City, 30th March, 1825.

BACON.

There is very little doing on *credit*; almost all the holders demand ready money.—On board, 56s. to 57s. Landed, 56s. to 58s.

BUTTER.

Landed: Carlow, 100s. to 102s.; or Dublin, Waterford, 93s. to 100s. Dutch, (best) 110s. to 112s.

CHEESE.

The demand for Cheese has considerably increased of late; but still the prices here leave *no profit* to those who bring from the country.

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at 11d. by the full-priced Bakers.

HOPS.

Maidstone, March 24.—There has been no variation in the Hop trade since our last account.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, March 28.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	4	4	to	4 10
Mutton ...	5	0	—	5 3
Veal	5	6	—	6 6
Pork	5	4	—	6 4
Beasts ...	3,012		Sheep ..	16,820
Calves ...	120		Pigs ...	130

NEWGATE, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	3	4	to	4 4
Mutton ...	4	0	—	4 10
Veal	4	0	—	6 0
Pork	4	4	—	6 4

LEADENHALL, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead):

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	3	4	to	4 6
Mutton ...	4	4	—	5 0
Veal	4	4	—	6 2
Pork	4	8	—	6 4

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS.—per Ton.

Ware	£ 3 10 to £5 10
Middlings.....	2 10 — 3 0
Chats.....	2 10 — 0 0
Common Red..	0 0 — 0 0

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£3 10 to £5 10
Middlings.....	2 10 — 3 0
Chats	2 0 — 2 5
Common Red..	3 10 — 4 10

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay....45s. to 100s.
 Straw...40s. to 48s.
 Clover.. 63s. to 110s.

Whitechapel.--Hay....66s. to 95s.
 Straw...42s. to 48s.
 Clover..80s. to 115s.

COAL MARKET, March 25.

Ships at Market. Ships sold. Price.

25½ Newcastle.. 10½ 29s. 6d. to 37s. 6d
 4 Sunderland.. 2½ 29s. 6d.—41s. 6d.

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	Wheat.			Barley.			Oats.			Beans.			Pease.		
	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.
Aylesbury	72	80	0	38	44	0	25	30	0	33	48	0	43	45	0
Banbury	60	80	0	45	49	0	25	30	0	40	56	0	0	0	0
Basingstoke	64	74	0	30	46	0	20	29	0	38	50	0	0	0	0
Bridport.....	64	70	0	34	37	0	24	0	0	46	0	0	0	0	0
Chelmsford.....	64	78	0	36	42	0	0	0	0	30	38	0	35	50	0
Derby.....	70	76	0	46	50	0	24	33	0	44	58	0	0	0	0
Devizes.....	60	78	0	31	48	0	26	34	0	36	56	0	0	0	0
Dorchester.....	50	74	0	32	42	0	23	31	0	42	53	0	0	0	0
Exeter.....	68	76	0	33	42	0	22	26	0	47	48	0	0	0	0
Eye	64	76	0	28	45	0	22	30	0	32	36	0	34	36	0
Guildford	60	85	0	36	47	0	24	32	0	40	46	0	40	45	0
Henley	66	81	0	27	50	0	21	30	0	30	50	0	40	47	0
Horncastle.....	60	68	0	32	44	0	17	25	0	38	48	0	0	0	0
Hungerford.....	58	76	0	30	43	0	23	34	0	40	58	0	0	0	0
Lewes	66	78	0	37	45	0	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newbury	61	80	0	32	46	0	17	32	0	37	50	0	37	44	0
Newcastle	58	72	0	30	44	0	20	28	0	38	42	0	38	54	0
Northampton....	64	77	0	41	46	0	24	27	0	36	38	0	0	0	0
Nottingham	67	0	0	47	0	0	27	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0
Reading	60	86	0	30	50	0	24	28	0	38	44	0	40	48	0
Stamford.....	68	75	0	40	48	0	21	31	0	35	40	0	0	0	0
Stowmarket	64	76	0	28	44	0	20	26	0	32	36	0	32	36	0
Swansea	64	0	0	33	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Truro	68	0	0	39	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uxbridge	62	89	0	33	49	0	25	32	0	38	44	0	42	46	0
Warminster.....	53	78	0	30	54	0	21	33	0	46	58	0	0	0	0
Winchester.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dalkeith*	30	38	6	29	36	0	19	23	0	18	21	0	17	20	0
Haddington*....	30	38	6	28	37	0	17	23	0	17	21	0	17	21	0

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

Liverpool, March 22.—The arrivals of Grain since this day se'nnight, owing to the prevalence of easterly winds, have been inconsiderable, although fully adequate to the demand, notwithstanding a further small reduction would have been submitted to during the past week. At the market of this day the principal enquiries were for fine fresh new Irish Wheats, some pretty considerable parcels of which were taken off at fully the prices of last Tuesday. Oats, for which there were but few buyers, may be quoted a halfpenny per bushel lower.

Imported into Liverpool, from the 15th to the 21st of March, 1825, inclusive:—Wheat, 1,369; Oats, 2,746; Malt, 2,440; Beans, 1,470; and Peas, 185 quarters. Flour, 715 sacks, per 280 lbs. Oatmeal, 100 packs, per 240 lbs.

Norwich, March 26.—In consequence of a decline in the country markets this week, but very few samples were shown here to-day; the needy millers were compelled from the scanty appearance to purchase the Wheat at much the same as last quoted. Barley begins to be a slow sale.

Bristol, March 26.—Our Corn markets are not abundantly supplied, yet sales are rather heavy.

Birmingham, March 24.—We had no briskness in any part of the trade to-day, and no material alteration of the prices of last week. The supplies of fine Grain generally were short, and Old Beans rather scarce: of other descriptions more than enough was at hand.

Ipswich, March 26.—We had to-day a very short supply of all Grain, and every thing was lower. Prices as follow:—Wheat, 63s. to 75s.; Barley, 30s. to 43s.; Beans, 35s. to 37s.; and Oats, 22s. to 28s. per quarter.

Wisbech, March 26.—We had again to-day a short supply of Wheat, which must be called a trifle lower; in other Grain no material alteration.

Boston, March 23.—Since the 16th inst. there has been scarcely any thing delivering here from the growers, (who are busy in the field,) and to-day at market there is very little offering. Fine dry samples of Wheat are full as dear, the millers wanting it; inferior rather lower. Oats have rallied again from the depression of last week, and now command quite as much as on this day se'nnight, although the buyers have been less anxious during the past week. Beans are dearer 1s. to 2s. per quarter, and scarcely any offering. Rye is wanted.

Wakefield, March 25.—The arrivals of Grain this week are pretty considerable; the trade continues to rule extremely dull for every article. Wheat is held at much the same terms as on this day se'nnight; but the millers seem not disposed to purchase to any extent, and where sales are forced, lower prices must be submitted to. Barley is in very limited demand, particularly stained qualities; all descriptions are 1s. to 2s. per qr. lower.

Hull, March 25.—We had not a large supply of Grain to-day. The holders of Wheat showed no disposition to make any reduction, and the buyers were equally indifferent to do business, except on lower terms, consequently the trade was stagnant. The few sales that took place may be considered about 1s. under the currency of last Tuesday.

Yarmouth, March 24.—Our market on Saturday was liberally supplied with Grain; fine Wheats maintained last week's prices. There was a good demand for the stained Barleys at 2s. to 3s. per quarter advance. Oats, Pease, and Beans were each a dull sale, and rather cheaper.

COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &c.

Norwich Castle Meadow, March 26.—There appeared several droves of good lean Scots for sale to-day, but few good fat beasts, except those shewn by the butchers intended for Easter. The lean beasts did not appear to go off readily, the salesmen demanding near 5s. per stone: there were few Sheep penned.—Fat Beef 6½d. to 8d.; Mutton 7d. to 8d.; Pork 6½d. to 8½d.; Veal 7d. to 8½d. per pound.

Horncastle, March 26.—Beef, 8s. per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 7d. to 8d.; Pork, 6d. to 7½d.; and Veal, 9d. to 10d. per lb.

Bristol, March 24.—Beef, from 6d. to 6½d.; Mutton, 8d. to 8½d.; and Pork, 6d. to 6½d. per lb. sinking offal.

Manchester, March 23.—On sale 2232 Sheep, at 6½d. to 9d. per lb. sinking the offal; 455 Cattle, at 4½d. to 7½d.; 12 Pigs.—Total 2699.

Malton, March 26.—Meat in the shambles.—Beef, 7d. to 8½d.; Mutton, 7d. to 8d.; Pork, 6½d. to 7½d.; and Veal 8d. to 10d. per lb. Fresh Butter, 15d. to 16d. per lb. of 18 oz. Bacon Sides, 7s. 6d.; Hams, 8s. 9d. to 10s. per stone of 14 lbs.

At *Morpeth Market*, on Wednesday, there was a very great supply of Cattle and Sheep; and although there were many buyers, both kinds met with a dull sale; prices much the same.—Beef, from 5s. 9d. to 6s. 9d.; Mutton, 6s. 9d. to 7s. 9d. per stone, sinking offal.

AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended March 19, 1825.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
London*	71	3	42	4	26	8
Essex	71	6	42	3	26	11
Kent	71	3	44	5	25	9
Sussex	70	9	39	7	25	6
Suffolk	70	9	39	6	26	9
Cambridgeshire	67	9	36	4	22	9
Norfolk	68	9	39	6	24	5
Lincolnshire	66	10	44	6	22	7
Yorkshire	63	9	41	5	22	3
Durham	61	7	0	0	25	10
Northumberland	61	6	39	0	24	0
Cumberland	67	4	37	2	23	6
Westmoreland	67	9	40	0	25	2
Lancashire	68	2	0	0	25	8
Cheshire	68	3	48	4	26	2
Gloucestershire	71	6	45	5	27	6
Somersetshire	69	11	41	0	28	10
Monmouthshire	69	0	43	5	25	4
Devonshire	67	3	39	1	19	2
Cornwall	65	4	36	11	25	9
Dorsetshire	69	4	37	1	24	4
Hampshire	67	4	37	10	0	0
North Wales	65	6	41	1	21	0
South Wales	60	7	34	3	20	0

* The London Average is always that of the Week preceding.